

1

## 2

3

4

5

6

(

)

9

O

—

1 By letter dated June 20, 2000, Ms. Jones notified Appellant of the decision. On July 21, 2000,  
2 Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel.

3  
4 The Director's designee, Joanel Zeller-Huart, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter  
5 dated February 12, 2001, the Director determined that Appellant's position should be reallocated to  
6 the Secretary-Senior classification. On March 12, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the  
7 Director's determination and requested that her position be reallocated to the Administrative  
8 Assistant A classification. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

9  
10 Appellant works for the Office of College Relations. She reports to the Vice President for College  
11 Advancement and Foundation Executive Director. The Office of College Relations and the  
12 Foundation are responsible for event planning, fundraising, donor relations, student scholarships  
13 and emergency grants, marketing and promotional activities, campus activities, and public relations.  
14 Appellant utilizes her substantive knowledge of the department's goals to perform a variety of work  
15 involving report preparation, monitoring financial records, processing donations, responding to  
16 inquiries and preparing correspondence, making travel and meeting arrangements, coordinating  
17 fund raising events, maintaining her supervisor's calendar, attending meetings on behalf of the  
18 department, taking and transcribing minutes of meetings, and providing information to the  
19 Foundation Board.

20  
21 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant expressed concerns about the allocation process  
22 and the length of time it took for Respondent to act on her allocation request. Appellant asserts that  
23 her supervisor was allowed to stall the allocation process and that Respondent did not abide by the  
24 policies and procedures for processing allocation requests both of which had an adverse impact of  
25 her ability to present her duties and responsibilities for review.

1 Appellant asserts that the Office of College Relations is a major component of SPSCC and that she  
2 provides direct support to the chief administrator of the unit. Appellant contends that she is  
3 responsible for coordinating fundraising events, interacting with other departments and entities  
4 involved in the events, and reporting to the Foundation Board on the financial outcome of the  
5 events. In addition, Appellant argues that she is assigned responsibility for processing donations of  
6 stocks and land to the college and advising the Foundation on the most beneficial way to handle the  
7 donation so that the Foundation can dispose of the items at the proper time to best serve the  
8 community. Appellant asserts that she has budgetary authority because she maintains three budgets  
9 and produces budget reports that are relied upon by others to develop budget requests, and after  
10 researching department needs, products and prices, she completes purchase request forms for  
11 signature by others. Appellant contends that she has a high level of responsibility and delegated  
12 authority that exceeds the level found in the Secretary-Senior classification. In addition, Appellant  
13 contends that the Secretary-Senior classification does not encompass her duties and responsibilities  
14 in regard to fundraising activities and donor support; planning, coordinating, and hosting major  
15 events; supporting student services; and acting as staff photographer. Appellant asserts that her  
16 position is best described by the Administrative Assistant A classification and should be  
17 reallocated.

18  
19 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that the Office of College Relations  
20 does not have significant responsibility for at least two functional areas and therefore is not a major  
21 organizational unit as envisioned by the Administrative Assistant A classification. Respondent  
22 further argues that Appellant's responsibility for planning and coordinating fundraising events is a  
23 team effort involving Appellant, her supervisor and her co-workers. Respondent contends that  
24 Appellant does not have delegated decision-making authority or signature authority as required for  
25 allocation to the Administrative Assistant A classification. Respondent asserts that Appellant  
26 performs complex clerical assignments and projects requiring substantive knowledge of office

1 policies and procedures, that she does not supervise the equivalent of one full-time employee, and  
2 that she has not been delegated administrative responsibility or given the level of authority intended  
3 to be encompassed by the Administrative Assistant A classification.

4  
5 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly  
6 allocated to the Secretary-Senior classification should be affirmed.

7  
8 **Relevant Classifications.** Secretary-Senior, class code 2243, and Administrative Assistant A, class  
9 code 2045.

10  
11 **Decision of the Board.** Appellant's exceptions raise a number of issues that are outside of the  
12 allocation process. For example, Appellant alleges that Respondent stalled the allocation process  
13 and failed to follow the appropriate process and procedures. These issues fall outside of the  
14 purpose of an allocation review, which is to determine which classification best describes the  
15 overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position.

16  
17 A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the  
18 available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best  
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington  
20 State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21  
22 The basic function of the Administrative Assistant A classification requires, in part, that incumbents  
23 provide staff support to the head of a major organizational unit or major administrative department  
24 in a combination of functional areas such as: instruction, research, business services, administration  
25 (including student services), trades, patient care, community service and extended institution  
26 services. The functions of the Office of College Relations are limited in scope and do not include

1 significant responsibility for more than one of these functional areas. Therefore, Appellant's  
2 position does not meet the basic function of this classification.

3  
4 Furthermore, incumbents allocated to the Administrative Assistant A classification are required to  
5 work under general direction, function as supervisors for at least one full-time staff person, and  
6 have significant delegated decision-making and signature authority. Appellant's position  
7 questionnaire indicates that Appellant's supervisor provides daily direction to Appellant rather than  
8 general direction. In addition, the information provided by Appellant fails to establish that she  
9 supervises the equivalent of one full-time subordinate. Moreover, while a portion of Appellant's  
10 responsibilities occasionally includes significant responsibility for representing the department, she  
11 does not have significant delegated decision-making authority. Also, while Appellant's  
12 responsibilities include monitoring and reporting on the status of three budgets, she does not have  
13 delegated signature authority for expenditures. Appellant's position is not described by the  
14 Administrative Assistant A classification.

15  
16 The Secretary-Senior classification encompasses positions that work under general supervision,  
17 coordinate office operations, establish office procedures and standards, establish priorities and  
18 deadlines, monitor and evaluate the status of budgets, maintain and prepare budget records, make  
19 travel arrangements and develop travel itineraries, prepare typed documents and reports, take and  
20 transcribe meeting minutes, resolve problems and respond to inquiries, and attend meetings on  
21 behalf of his/her supervisor and work group. In addition, incumbents direct the work of others,  
22 have frequent contact with students, faculty, public and staff from other departments, and take  
23 action to ensure work unit and/or office goals are met. Appellant's duties and responsibilities fit  
24 within the functional scope and level of authority encompassed by the Secretary-Senior  
25 classification.

1 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's  
2 determination dated February 12, 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

3  
4 **ORDER**

5 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is  
6 denied and the Director's determination dated February 12, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy  
7 is attached.

8 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

9  
10 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

11  
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member